



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/019,100

08/21/2003

Zahir Saidi

34074.00887LDSE.09.US.CIP

8648

61214 7590 03/09/2010
Fox Rothschild, LLP
Elan Pharma International Limited
997 Lenox Drive, Bldg. #3
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648

EXAMINER

SOROUSH, LAYLA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1627

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/09/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/019,100	SAIDI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LAYLA SOROUGH	1627	

All Participants:

(1) LAYLA SOROUGH.

(2) Vyacheslav V Vasilyev.

Status of Application: Appeal Brief

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 February 2010

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

All claims of record

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

~~/SREENI PADMANABHAN/~~

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1627

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's question regarding the status of claims was addressed. The discussion entailed whether Applicant was in fact required to submit the full listing of claims and status identifiers for the Appeal Brief submitted on 11/09/09. The Applicant was directed to the MPEP and notified that the Appeal Brief was defective due to the lack of status identifiers and full listing of claims.